

IN THE UNITED STATES MIDDLE  
DISTRICT OF ALABAMA

Courtney Boyd  
Plaintiff

RECEIVED

2006 NOV 27 A 10: 23

VS

Dr. Dar Bouze et al

Defendant

THOMAS P. HACKETT, C.J.  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT ALA.

Case No: 2:06-CV-511-WKW

OBJECTION TO THE Court Order on  
November 14, 2006 Notice of Appeal  
Comes Now, The plaintiff, Courtney Boyd, pro/se  
moves into this Honorable Court objecting to the Court  
Order on November 14, 2006 And Notice of Appeal. The  
plaintiff submit the following:

- (1) The Plaintiff filed a Motion TO Compel on Oct.  
17, 2006, Requesting that his medical profiles be renewed by  
the Defendants.
- (2) THE Defendants filed a response on November  
9, 2006. The Defendant filed a response, but does not  
show what medical Judgment he basis his Judgment from.
- (3). The Defendants never once made talk of any Spandy 101's-  
thesis was detected on June 4, 2006 until After the Medical  
Report of Dr. Amy L. Bentley M.D. See Traverse filed by  
the Plaintiff at Exhibit C.

Page 1

4. The Defendant Dr. Darbouze is not Certified to make any Judgment about any back injury. However Dr. Amy L. Bentley M.D. is Certified to make this Judgment.

5. The Defendant in attempt to try to get this Court to denied the plaintiff's Motion, ~~submit~~ <sup>submit</sup> an got an Affidavit for Dr. Corbier, but what Dr. Corbier does not say in this Affidavit, is that the real reason he given the plaintiff these profiles, is because he seen Dr. Bentley medical Report. Dr. Corbier even say that he will send me out for ~~an~~ "MRI" done on my back.

6. Dr. Corbier does not say what so ever, why he argues with Dr. Darbouze. The only thing he says is that Dr. Darbouze has not seen the plaintiff more than him. That's not good even though, because before this Affidavit, Dr. Corbier did not ~~know~~ <sup>known</sup> that the Plaintiff has a suit against Dr. Darbouze for ~~these~~ <sup>taken</sup> some of these profiles. This Affidavit Dr. Corbier proven is bias and presuice to the plaintiff, because both Doctor work for the Company who the plaintiff is suit, because the Defendant told his back brace problem ~~and~~ <sup>when</sup> he came to see him, about a ne long standing problem. Dr. Darbouze suit told the plaintiff that he don't write Dr. Corbier profiles. So Dr. Corbier have lack of interest in writing this Affidavit, so under the Fed. R. Civ. Pro. Rule 616. The plaintiff request that the Affidavit Dr. Corbier proven be dismissed.

Page 2

7. The Plaintiff requests that this Court Order on November 14, 2006, be set, and his Motion to Compel be granted, because the Defendant Dr. Darbouze did not show Cause why the motion should not be Granted. All Dr. Darbouze did was say that it was not his medical judgment that the Plaintiff should ~~not~~ <sup>have these</sup> ~~have~~ prostheses. That was not the Court's order. The order ~~of~~ of the Court was for Dr. Darbouze to show good Cause why the Motion should not be Granted, and he ~~has~~ <sup>has not</sup> ~~did~~ that.

(8). The Defendant has taking the plaintiff off his medication which was for his back. Since this Court has denied this the plaintiff's Motion. The Defendant can not show no reason other than him, saying it is against his medical judgment, but what medical judgment is this? This is what he should have shown this Court and the plaintiff.

(9). If this Objection is denied, then the plaintiff requests to ~~appeal~~ <sup>appeal</sup> this judgment.

Wherefore, I Pray that this motion is granted.

Certification of Service

I hereby certify I have served a copy of the foregoing upon the Defendant Counsel by placing it into the Eastern's Courtroom Mail box on November 16, 2006.

County Clerk